DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 824 SO 011 312

TITLE	Action Resulting from CEAFU's Textbook Bias Study.
INSTITUTION	National Right to Work Committee, Fairfax, Va.
PUB DATE	[78]
NOTE	52p.; For a related document, see SO 011 311
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism; *Adoption (Ideas); American Government (Course); Business Correspondence; Educational Objectives; Educational Problems; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); History Instruction; *Labor Legislation; Labor Unions; Letters (Correspondence); Political Issues; Publishing Industry; Secondary Education; Social Studies; *Textbook Bias; Textbook Evaluation; *Textbook Selection; United States History

ABSTRACT

The document contains letters of complaint sent by Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism (CEAFU) to boards of education and publishers regarding inaccurate and/or unfair coverage of the right to work issue in high school social studies textbooks. Examples of complaints filed with boards of education are presented for state-adopted textbooks and for district-adopted textbooks. Because of the difficulties involved in corresponding with individual districts, CEAFU staff members have concentrated most of their efforts at the state level in 20 states which have adopted objectionable textbooks. Priority states are identified and a list of complaints to be filed in the near future is included. A sample is presented of the 22 letters of text evaluation sent by CEAFU to publishing companies. Letters of reply by six publishing companies conclude the document. Textbook publishers indicate that they are willing to review CEAFU evaluations of their texts and that they agree to take CEAFU criticisms into consideration in future publications. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161824

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan Straub

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ACTION RESULTING FROM CEAFU's TEXTBOOK BIAS STUDY

SO-011312

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. COMPLAINTS FILED WITH BOARDS OF EDUCATION

A. Priority states for filing complaints

B. Social studies adoption dates (in states with statewide adoption)

C. Complaints filed in *state-adopting states

D. Complaints filed in *district-adopting states

E. Complaints to be filed in 1978

II. COMPLAINTS FILED WITH TEXTBOOK PUBLISHERS

*terms defined on following pages

I. COMPLAINTS FILED WITH BOARDS OF EDUCATION

PRIORITY STATES FOR FILING COMPLAINTS

The following list identifies priority states in our effort to fight textbook bias against Right to Work.

As the list indicates, the states are divided according to their method of textbook adoption, into two categories. These two categories are 1) states which adopt at the state level, and 2) states which adopt at the district level. In state-adopting states the State Board of Education approves an official textbook list from which all schools within the state must adopt. In district-adopting states textbook adoptions are left totally to individual districts within the state.

Currently, we are concentrating our efforts to revise texts biased against Right to Work in the 20 state-adopting states, and the 7 Right to Work states which adopt at the district level. The details of our involvement in these states are described in the following material.

State-adopting States (20)

RTW (13)	NON-RTW (7)
Alabama	*Hawaii*
Arkansas	*Idaho*
Florida	*Indiana*
Georgia	*Kentucky*
Louisiana	*New Mexico*
Mississippi	*Oklahoma*
Nevada	*Oregon*
North Carolina	
South Carolina	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah	
Virginia	

District-adopting States (30)

RTW (7)	NON-RTW (23)	
Arizona	Alaska	Montana
Iowa	California	New Hampshire
Kansas	Colorado	New Jersey
Nebraska	Connecticut	New York
North Dakota	Delaware	Ohio
South Dakota	Illinois	Pennsylvania
Wyoming	Maine	Rhode Island
	Maryland	Vermont
	Massachusetts	Washington
	Michigan	West Virginia
	Minnesota	Wisconsin
	Missouri	

Italics indicate priority states

States with Statewide Adoption

RTW STATES

Alabama - next social studies adoption -- 1980.

Arkansas - next social studies adoption -- 1980.

**Florida - next social studies adoption -- 1980. (Economics - next adoption will be in 1983.)

Georgia - next social studies adoption -- 1981.

Louisiana - next social studies adoption -- 1980.

Mississippi - next social studies adoption -- 1980.

*Nevada - complaint sent March, 1978.

*North Carolina - complaint sent January, 1978.

***South Carolina - Citizenship, civics, economics and government adoptions - 1978. Adoption dates have not been set for other social studies subjects.*

***Texas - next adoption for American History - 1978. Adoption dates for other social studies subjects are tentative.*

*Utah - complaint sent September, 1977.

Virginia - next social studies adoption - 1978.

NON-RTW STATES

Hawaii - next social studies adoption -- date has not been set. Last social studies adoption was in 1977.

Idaho - next social studies adoption -- 1982.

Indiana - next social studies adoption -- 1978.

Kentucky - Next social studies adoption -- 1981.

New Mexico - next social studies adoption -- 1979.

Oklahoma - next social studies -- 1979.

Oregon - next social studies adoption -- 1978.

SOCIAL STUDIES ADOPTION DATES

*Complaints are explained in more detail in following material.

**In most states all subjects in the social studies field are adopted at the same time. In this instance all subjects in the field of social studies are not considered in the same year.

Italics - states with upcoming social studies adoptions. Details outlined in the following material.

Complaints Filed in State-adopting States

Since last year's CEAFU seminar, complaints have been filed against texts which are offensive to Right to Work in three state-adopting states. These states are Utah, North Carolina, and Nevada.

Attached as an example of a complaint is the letter and supporting materials sent in March to the Nevada State Textbook Commission. The complaints sent to North Carolina and Utah are similar to the Nevada complaint.

Also attached are copies of letters from all three states, responding to CEAFU's accusation of bias in state-approved social studies texts.

The November 30 letter from Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company documents our first major breakthrough in challenging State Board's of Education to adopt texts which present controversial issues in a fair and accurate manner. The Merrill letter is the result of our complaint to the Utah State Board of Education, which in turn forwarded the complaint to the publisher of a text judged by CEAFU to be offensive to Right to Work.

The January 20 letter from North Carolina's Superintendent of Public Instruction is not so optimistic as our response from Utah. However, our January 25 letter appealing to North Carolina Right to Work members to write their State Superintendent encouraging fair treatment of the Right to Work issue in North Carolina's textbooks, is an example of our belief in the importance of support to the Textbook Bias Project from those who are affected by textbook bias on the grassroots level.

The final attachment is from the Nevada Department of Education. As suggested in the letter, we will be proceeding in Nevada by forwarding our complaint to district superintendents. Addresses of Nevada District Superintendents are included for those who are interested in expressing their concern for fair treatment of the Right to Work issue in Nevada's textbooks.

Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism

Advisory Board Co-Chairmen

Dr. Edward F. Brafke
Principal
Nether-Providence High School
Wallingford, Pennsylvania

Dr. Fred R. Glahe
Professor of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Shirley K. Schaaf
classroom teacher
President, Kansas City Education Association
Kansas City, Missouri

March 7, 1978

COPY

Mr. Victor M. Hyden
Executive Secretary
Nevada State Textbook Commission
Nevada Department of Education
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Dear Mr. Hyden:

In response to your letter of January 20, we are pleased to know you are sensitive to the possibility of bias and inaccuracies of the Right to Work issue in textbooks now in use in Nevada.

Enclosed we have listed ten textbooks currently on Nevada's adoption list which we consider to be either biased in the presentation of the Right to Work issue, or inaccurate by the omission of any mention of the Taft-Hartley Law or Right to Work Laws.

We know you would agree that in any social studies course in which the labor movement is discussed, the subject should be taught in its objective entirety. Particularly in Nevada, itself a Right to Work state, it would seem imperative that students be made aware of the existing laws as well as the impetus for their adoption.

After you have had an opportunity to peruse the enclosed information, we would appreciate hearing about any action taken concerning this complaint. If we can provide further information or assistance of any sort, please advise us immediately.

Thank you very much for whatever efforts you may undertake to see that our objections are voiced.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Staub
Staff Director

SES/slw
Enclosures

8316 Arlington Boulevard, Fairfax, Virginia 22038 (703) 573-0505
a division of the National Right to Work Committee

CEAFU would like to urge the Nevada Textbook Commission to make it a policy to adopt textbooks which not only present the Right to Work issue, but present the issue in an accurate and unbiased manner.

The following social studies texts do not mention the Right to Work issue in their discussion of the American Labor Movement, nor do they mention the Taft-Hartley Law wherein state Right to Work laws are protected. We believe that in the interest of fairness and accuracy these texts should be removed from the official textbook list in Nevada until such time that their publishers have taken action to correct this error. These textbooks are:

(1) THE FREE AND THE BRAVE, SECOND EDITION, (8th grade) (also simplified version); Graff; Rand McNally & Co., 1972

(2) THE IMPACT OF OUR PAST: A HISTORY OF OUR PAST; Bernard Weisberger, Gerald Hardcastle; McGraw-Hill Book Co., Webster Division, 1972

(3) AMERICA, A MODERN HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES; Freidel & Drewry; D. C. Heath & Co., 1969

(4) AMERICAN POLITICAL BEHAVIOR; Howard Mehlinger, John J. Patrick; Ginn and Co., 1972

(5) RISE OF AMERICAN NATION, VOL. 2; Todd, Curti, Krug; Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1967

(6) THE SHAPING OF AMERICA (THE SHAPING OF AMERICAN CIVILIZATION SINCE 1865); Richard O. Curry, John G. Sproat, Kenyon C. Cramer; Winston Press, Minneapolis, 1972

(7) LIBERTY AND UNION: A HISTORY OF THE U.S.; Wilson & Spiero; Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972

(8) MANY PEOPLES, ONE NATION; Peter I. Rose; Random House, Inc., 1973

CEAFU would like to file specific complaints against the following two texts, based on these points:

(1) Nevada is a Right to Work state, that is, it has a Right to Work law. (A copy of that law is attached. In brief, it states that no citizen of Nevada may be denied employment because of membership or nonmembership in a labor union.)

(2) Regardless of whether Nevada is a Right to Work state, it is a sound assumption that it is the duty of educators in a free public education system, when presenting controversial issues, we emphasize, to exercise due caution in seeing that the issues are presented fairly and accurately. Fairness and accuracy certainly must be among the criteria used by Nevada's Textbook Commission in its textbook evaluations.

We consider the treatment evidenced in the following examples to be unconscionable in a school text. It would seem in the light of the above points that an accurate and fair presentation of the Right to Work issue in Nevada's textbooks would be a goal that CEAFU and the Textbook Commission would share.

The textbooks we find deficient are:

(1) AMERICAN GOVERNMENT IN ACTION; Miriam Roher Resnick & Lillian Herlich Nerenberg; Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., Columbus, Ohio, 1969*

(2) PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY, POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC; William E. Dunwiddie; Ginn and Company, 1970

Our specific objections to these texts are detailed on the following pages.

---

*The publisher has agreed to revise this text per the attached letter. We would like to suggest that either this textbook not be used until the revision is complete or that teachers be notified of the situation.

(1) AMERICAN GOVERNMENT IN ACTION; Miriam Roher Resnick & Lillian Herlich Nerenberg; Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., Columbus, Ohio, 1969

Text

. . . about two-fifths of the states, most of them in agricultural areas, have made the union shop illegal by passing so-called(1) "right-to-work" laws. In other states, right-to-work laws have been defeated by those who maintain that the right to unionize is an important aspect of the right to hold a job(2).

A compromise arrangement now permitted in some states is the agency shop(3) -- a plan whereby workers in an industry who do not want to join the union pay a monthly service charge to the union in exchange for its collective bargaining services. Since they do not pay full union dues, they are not considered union members and are not entitled to receive other union benefits such as union-sponsored retirement or hospitalization plans. (p. 421)

Evaluation

(1) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. The editorial reprinted below is particularly appropriate in view of the occasional use of the phrase "so-called Right to Work laws" in stories about the issues of compulsory vs. voluntary unionism.

So-Called Comment on 'So-Called'

An Editorial From the Houston, Tex., Chronicle

THE LITTLE grammatical gimmick "so-called" is a phrase which we'd like to see dropped from news stories, articles of political comment and loaded phrases. You only use it when you are trying to make somebody or something look bad.

* * *

FOR EXAMPLE, there are liberals and conservatives and Democrats and Republicans. But that's not quite the same as so-called liberals, so-called conservatives, so-called Democrats or so-called Republicans. Preceding a noun with this phrase is a way of holding your nose in print. And that doesn't contribute anything to the power or the logic or the persuasiveness of an argument.

Take a simple sentence: "Mr. Jones is the father of two boys." Now try it this way: "Mr. Jones is the so-called father of two so-called boys." In this second sentence it's quite obvious we think poorly of Mr. Jones and his boys, but we aren't straight-forward enough to say it or to explain our reasons for it.

* * *

"SO-CALLED" is a snide, sneaky expression, and we don't like it. That is our opinion. But we realize that some other so-called persons have their own so-called opinions and they won't pay any attention at all to this so-called line of reasoning.

(2) This sentence strongly implies that Right to Work laws prohibit unionization. This is false. Right to Work laws guarantee the right to join a union. The basic premise of Right to Work laws is that no person should be compelled, as a condition of employment, to join or not to join a labor union.

(3) In calling the "agency shop" a "compromise arrangement", this phrase expresses only the opinion of "agency shop" proponents. Right to Work supporters consider the "agency shop" another form of compulsion and do not accept it as a compromise.

(2) PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY, POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC; William E. Dunwiddie; Ginn and Company, 1970

Text

. . . Union workers strongly resent the "free rider", the fellow who is willing to get the benefits gained by the union but who is unwilling even to pay union dues. One union leader has summarized the feelings of union workers in this way: "We have always felt that it is manifestly unfair that individual employees should be permitted to obtain all of the benefits which result from the collective bargaining process and be subject to none of the obligations of that process." Another has put the argument more colorfully: "The philosophy of the 'free rider' is the philosophy of the 'chiseler, the tax dodger...the man who rides the train without paying his fare. He enjoys what others have created without paying his share of the freight"(1).

. . . The hotly disputed section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permits states to pass so-called(2) "right-to-work" laws. Nineteen states have laws that prohibit agreements between unions and companies to make union membership a condition of continued employment(3). (pp. 267-268)

Evaluation

(1) This passage presents the "free rider" argument as fact. The other side of the argument is that the non-union worker is represented by the union whether he wants to be or not. He is a "captive passenger" rather than a "free rider". (It is the unions who demand "exclusive representation", the privilege of being the sole representative of the bargaining unit. That privilege is granted under the Wagner Act of 1935). Motives for refraining from union membership abound. Many workers do so because their dues pay not just for collective bargaining, but for political campaigns, social and economic propaganda, insurance, etc., some or all of which they may not wish to support.

It is also not true that all "union workers strongly resent" workers who do not choose to join the union. In a survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation in March, 1976, 49% of the union members surveyed favored the working arrangement in which "a man can hold a job whether or not he belongs to a union", over the arrangement in which "a man can get a job if he doesn't already belong, but has to join after he is hired."

(2) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See previous discussion on this term.)

(3) The "nineteen states" is now out-of-date, as is the map of Right to Work states. There are now twenty.

NEVADA'S RIGHT TO WORK LAW

Nev. Rev. Stat. §§613.230-613.300 (1973) (adopted at general election November 4, 1952, effective 1953).

"SECTION 613.230. 'LABOR ORGANIZATION' DEFINED. -- AS USED IN NRS 613.230 TO 613.300, INCLUSIVE, THE TERM 'LABOR ORGANIZATION' MEANS ANY ORGANIZATION OF ANY KIND, OR ANY AGENCY OR EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATION COMMITTEE OR PLAN, IN WHICH EMPLOYEES PARTICIPATE AND WHICH EXISTS FOR THE PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, OF DEALING WITH EMPLOYERS CONCERNING GRIEVANCES, LABOR DISPUTES, WAGES, RATES OF PAY, HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT, OR OTHER CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT."

COMMENT

Under §14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act, state power to regulate labor union security agreements begins with actual negotiation and execution of agreement. Damages for picketing to compel signature of agreement found to violate right to work laws, NRS 613.230 et seq., could not therefore be awarded by state court, because it had no jurisdiction to determine legality of agreement not yet signed. Painter's Local 567 v. Tom Joyce Floors, Inc., 81 Nev. 1, 398 P.2d 245 (1965).

Where labor union proposed to employer establishment of hiring hall to be operated by union but on condition that union membership not be required for referral or employment, NRS 613.230 et seq. could not be construed to prohibit such contract because federal law authorizes states to prohibit only requirement of union membership as condition of employment. NLRB v. Tom Joyce Floors, Inc., 353 F.2d 768 (9th Cir. 1965).

In action to enforce order relating to labor practices, although construction by Nevada district court of state right to work law,

NRS 613.230 et seq., was binding on federal court, extent to which state regulation of labor relations was permissible presented federal question. NLRB v. Tom Joyce Floors, Inc., supra.

"SECTION 613.240. 'PERSON' DEFINED. -- AS USED IN NRS 613.230 TO 613.300, INCLUSIVE, THE WORD 'PERSON' INCLUDES A CORPORATION, ASSOCIATION, COMPANY, FIRM OR LABOR ORGANIZATION, AS WELL AS A NATURAL PERSON."

"SECTION 613.250. AGREEMENTS PROHIBITING EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF NONMEMBERSHIP IN LABOR ORGANIZATION PROHIBITED. -- NO PERSON SHALL BE DENIED THE OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN OR RETAIN EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF NONMEMBERSHIP IN A LABOR ORGANIZATION, OR SHALL THE STATE, OR ANY SUBDIVISION THEREOF OR ANY CORPORATION, INDIVIDUAL OR ASSOCIATION OF ANY KIND ENTER INTO ANY AGREEMENT, WRITTEN OR ORAL, WHICH EXCLUDES ANY PERSON FROM EMPLOYMENT OR CONTINUATION OF EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF NONMEMBERSHIP IN A LABOR ORGANIZATION."

COMMENT

Agency shop provision is illegal under NRS 613.250. Independent Guard Assn. v. Wackenhut Services, Inc., 90 Nev. 198, 522 P.2d 1010 (1974).

Agreement by employer to hire only union employees is unlawful under sec. 2, ch. 1, Stats. 1952 (NRS 613.250). Provision for hiring outside if union did not furnish workers within 48 hours did not make agreement any less a denial. Building Trades Council v. Bonito, 71 Nev. 84, 280 P.2d 295 (1955).

Nevada right to work law, NRS 613.230 - 613.300, prohibits agency shop agreements which provide that nonunion employees, as a condition of continued employment, shall pay to union an amount equal to that paid by union members for initiation fees, dues and assessments. Amalgamated Assn. of St., Elec. Ry. & Motor Coach Employees v. Las Vegas-Tonopah-Reno Stage Line, Inc., 202 F. Supp. 726 (D. Nev. 1962), aff'd, 319 F.2d 783 (9th Cir. 1963).

COMMENT

Nevada right to work law, NRS 613.230 - 613.300, prohibits agency shop agreements which provide that nonunion employees, as condition of continued employment, shall pay to union an amount equal to that paid by union members for initiation fees, dues and assessments. Amalgamated Assn. of St., Elec. Ry. & Motor Coach Employees v. Las Vegas-Tonopah-Reno Stage Line, Inc., supra.

"SECTION 613.270. COMPELLING PERSON TO JOIN A LABOR ORGANIZATION OR TO STRIKE AGAINST HIS WILL OR TO LEAVE HIS EMPLOYMENT PROHIBITED. -- IT SHALL BE UNLAWFUL FOR ANY EMPLOYEE, LABOR ORGANIZATION, OR OFFICER, AGENT OR MEMBER THEREOF TO COMPEL OR ATTEMPT TO COMPEL ANY PERSON TO JOIN ANY LABOR ORGANIZATION OR TO STRIKE AGAINST HIS WILL OR TO LEAVE HIS EMPLOYMENT BY ANY THREATENED OR ACTUAL INTERFERENCE WITH HIS PERSON, IMMEDIATE FAMILY OR PROPERTY."

"SECTION 613.280. CONSPIRACIES TO VIOLATE NRS 613.230 TO 613.300 PROHIBITED. -- ANY COMBINATION OR CONSPIRACY BY TWO OR MORE PERSONS TO CAUSE THE DISCHARGE OF ANY PERSON OR TO CAUSE HIM TO BE DENIED EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE HE IS NOT A MEMBER OF A LABOR ORGANIZATION, BY INDUCING OR ATTEMPTING TO INDUCE ANY OTHER PERSON TO REFUSE TO WORK WITH SUCH PERSON, SHALL BE ILLEGAL."

COMMENT

In civil action for conspiracy to impede employment of nonmember of labor union, under NRS 613.280, international union was not liable for misconduct of local union unless international actively took part in local affairs. Bair v. Berry, 86 Nev. 26, 464 P.2d 469 (1970).

Agency shop agreement between union and employer which requires that nonunion employees shall pay initiation fees and dues to union or be discharged is in violation of NRS 613.250. Nevada has power, under federal law, to outlaw such agency shop agreements. Amalgamated Assn. of St., Elec. Ry. & Motor Coach Employees v. Las Vegas-Tonopah-Reno Stage Line, Inc., supra.

Inclusion in collective bargaining agreement of "agency shop" clause, requiring nonunion employees to pay periodically to union sums equal to amounts paid as dues by union members, and providing for discharge for nonpayment and for payment of sum equal to quarterly dues as condition of subsequent registration with employment agency, violates NRS 613.250. Op.Atty.Gen. 407 (1958).

Provisions of NRS 611.010 - 611.320, governing conditions for registration with employment agencies, are exclusive, and private agencies or organizations may not prescribe conditions under which prospective employees may register with employment office. Op.Atty.Gen. 407 (1958).

"Right to Work" law was enacted for express purpose of guaranteeing everyone right to work regardless of whether or not he belongs to a union. Op.Atty.Gen. 407 (1958).

What the law prohibits directly cannot be accomplished indirectly and, therefore, "agency shop" clause in collective bargaining contract is violation of "right to work" law. Op.Atty. Gen. 407 (1958).

"SECTION 613.260. CERTAIN CONTRACTS DECLARED ILLEGAL AND VOID. -- ANY ACT OR ANY PROVISION IN ANY AGREEMENT WHICH IS IN VIOLATION OF NRS 613.230 TO 613.300, INCLUSIVE, SHALL BE ILLEGAL AND VOID. ANY STRIKE OR PICKETING TO FORCE OR INDUCE ANY EMPLOYER TO MAKE AN AGREEMENT IN WRITING OR ORALLY IN VIOLATION OF NRS 613.230 TO 613.300, INCLUSIVE, SHALL BE FOR AN ILLEGAL PURPOSE."

"SECTION 613.290. LIABILITY FOR DAMAGES. -- ANY PERSON WHO VIOLATES ANY PROVISION OF NRS 613.230 TO 613.300, INCLUSIVE, OR WHO ENTERS INTO ANY AGREEMENT CONTAINING A PROVISION DECLARED ILLEGAL BY NRS 613.230 TO 613.300, INCLUSIVE, OR WHO SHALL BRING ABOUT THE DISCHARGE OR THE DENIAL OF EMPLOYMENT OF ANY PERSON BECAUSE OF NONMEMBERSHIP IN A LABOR ORGANIZATION SHALL BE LIABLE TO THE PERSON INJURED AS A RESULT OF SUCH ACT OR PROVISION AND MAY BE SUED THEREFOR, AND IN ANY SUCH ACTION ANY LABOR ORGANIZATION, SUBDIVISION OR LOCAL THEREOF SHALL BE HELD TO BE BOUND BY THE ACTS OF ITS DULY AUTHORIZED AGENTS ACTING WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THEIR AUTHORITY AND MAY SUE OR BE SUED IN ITS COMMON NAME."

"SECTION 613.300. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF. -- ANY PERSON INJURED OR THREATENED WITH INJURY BY AN ACT DECLARED ILLEGAL BY NRS 613.230 TO 613.300, INCLUSIVE, SHALL, NOTWITHSTANDING ANY OTHER PROVISION OF THE LAW TO THE CONTRARY, BE ENTITLED TO INJUNCTIVE RELIEF THEREFROM."

COMMENT

In action by motel owner to enjoin group of labor unions from placing him on "do not patronize" list, where purpose was to require him to agree to hire only union help if available, preliminary injunction was authorized under sec. 7, ch. 1, Stats. 1953 (NRS 613.300), providing for injunctive relief to any person injured or threatened with injury from violation of "right to work" law. Building Trades Council v. Bonito, supra.

Legislature has provided for injunctive relief against violation of statute prohibiting denial of employment because of non-membership in labor organization, ch. 1, Stats. 1953 (cf. NRS 613.230 et seq.), and it is not necessary independently to show irreparable injury in order to entitle person injured to injunctive relief so provided in sec. 7, ch. 1, Stats. 1953 (NRS 613.300). Ringelberg v. United Assn. of Journeymen, 72 Nev. 156, 297 P.2d 1079 (1956).

On motion in appellate court for injunction pending appeal from denial by trial court of injunction pendente lite in action to enjoin

labor union from striking in violation of right to work law under sec. 7, ch. 1, Stats. 1953 (NRS 613.300), where trial court had found facts and tentatively concluded that no violation existed, appellate court refused to examine conclusion in order not to prejudge merits of pending controversy, and no abuse of discretion was shown prima facie. Ringelberg v. United Assn. of Journeymen, supra.

On motion in appellate court for injunction pending appeal from denial by trial court of injunction pendente lite in action to enjoin labor union from striking in violation of right to work law under sec. 7, ch. 1, Stats. 1953 (NRS 613.300), where no prima facie showing was made of abuse of discretion by trial judge, injunction could be granted only on showing of irreparable injury. Ringelberg v. United Assn. of Journeymen, supra.

In action to enjoin violation of right to work law under sec. 7, ch. 1, Stats. 1953 (NRS 613.300), where it appeared that labor union demanded as minimum that nonunion employee of plumbing shop desist from cutting pipe as part of his duties as clerk, and that this task be performed by union member, injury which would be suffered by complying with such a demand pending determination of case on merits was ascertainable in money and fully compensable, and motion for temporary injunction pending appeal was denied. Ringelberg v. United Assn. of Journeymen, supra.

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
UTAH STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

250 East Fifth South Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

[redacted] STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

December 2, 1977

Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

This is in response to your previous correspondence of September 28, 1977 to this office regarding the treatment of the Right to Work issue in some high school social studies textbooks.

You will be interested to learn that your concern was discussed during our Utah State Course of Study/Textbook Commission Meeting on November 11, 1977. The Commission moved to approve the recommendation of Mr. Boone Colegrove, specialist in social studies education, that the Commission contact the publishers to inform them of your concerns which he feels are justified; to advise them that we will be reevaluating these texts again next summer (evaluations are usually done in August) prior to our Textbook Adoption Meeting to be held in November 1978; and to encourage them to take these criticisms into consideration and make what revisions they feel will be helpful in alleviating your concerns.

We hope this action will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

LERUE WINGET
Secretary
Utah State Course of Study Committee/
Textbook Commission

dp

LERUE WINGET, Associate Superintendent
Office of Instruction Services

BERNARR S. FURSE, Administrative Assistant
and Federal Programs

JAY J. CAMPBELL, Associate Superintendent
Office of Administration and Institution Services

AVARD A. RIGBY, Assistant to the
Superintendent

VAUGHN L. HALL, Associate Superintendent
Office of Adult, Vocational, and Rehabilitation Services

T. JOE SANDOVAL, Administrative Assistant
Human Relations / Multi-Cultural Education

Telephone (801) 533-5431

CHARLES E MERRILL PUBLISHING COMPANY
A BELL & HOWELL COMPANY

SERVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS SINCE 1842

1300 Alum Creek Drive Columbus, Ohio 43216 (614) 258-8441

November 30, 1977

COPY

Ms. Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

Your letter and enclosures detailing criticisms regarding coverage on "right-to-work" laws in our text, American Government in Action, sent to Mr. Boone C. Colegrove, the Social Studies Specialist of the Utah State Board of Education, have been forwarded to us.

First, I would like to let you know that the criticisms you raised have been turned over to the editorial department, and I am certain that appropriate changes in the text regarding the "right-to-work" coverage will be made at the first opportunity.

Certainly, I would agree that "so-called" tends to lend an aura of question to "legitimate" laws. Right-to-work laws are right-to-work laws.

Charles E. Merrill Company is always interested in improving its publications to meet the needs of students. Certainly presenting any controversial issue should be done in a fair and accurate manner. Unconscious editorializing whenever noticed should be corrected to eliminate "bias."

We thank you for raising this matter and we will take steps to correct it in revisions of the material.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Kellar

Robert E. Kellar
Senior Product Manager,
Social Studies

REK/lb
cc: Jeanne Truex
Alta Moser

BELL & HOWELL

State of North Carolina
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Raleigh 27611

A. CRAIG PHILLIPS
SUPERINTENDENT

JEROME H. MELTON
DEPUTY
SUPERINTENDENT

January 20, 1978

Ms. Susan E. Staub, Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

This is in response to your letter of January 10 to Dr. Phillips in which you make reference to certain textbooks and the treatment of unionism. Our textbook program provides for evaluation of all texts by a Commission composed of teachers and laymen with recommendations from the Commission to the State Board of Education. The Board makes the final decisions as to which books to place on our multiple adoption list. Local administrators and teachers determine which specific books from the several on our adopted list will be used in the local schools.

This process of major participation by lay and professional citizens has served well in North Carolina. We see no reason to alter the process or create obstructions by singling out books which should not be considered. In fact, our citizens would consider this to be censorship and a reflection on their capabilities. Thus, while we appreciate your interest, we will continue to allow our system to operate without interference.

Sincerely,

Jerome H. Melton

JHM:jn

cc: Dr. A. Craig Phillips

Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism

Advisory Board Co-Chairmen

Neil S. Bishop
former high school principal
Chairman, Maine Senate Education Committee
Stockton Springs, Maine

Dr. Fred R. Glahe
Professor of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Shirley K. Schaaf
classroom teacher
President, Kansas City Education Association
Kansas City, Missouri

January 25, 1978

Mr. Jerome H. Melton
Deputy Superintendent
State of North Carolina
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Dear Mr. Melton:

Thank you for your letter of January 20.

While we certainly don't quarrel with the prevailing policy in North Carolina considering textbook selection to be a matter of local determination, we cannot agree that our pointing out serious deficiencies in those texts which discuss the Right to Work issue constitutes interference.

Our 26,000 North Carolina members and supporters are gravely concerned that texts may be used which do not fairly and accurately present Right to Work laws.

As members of the National Right to Work Committee, they have every right to expect that we will identify and seek to correct any instructional treatment that is misleading for their children.

We cannot agree, further, that singling out irrefutalbe examples of erroneous information could in any way constitute an attempt at censorship.

Mr. Melton, we are not considering opinions in our objections. We are challenging passages which purport to be factual but are, rather, seriously inaccurate.

We are asking not that this issue be taught as "right", but that it be taught correctly.

We understand if you do not wish to work with our offices to correct the errors discovered in texts on your approved State list. But do you not recognize a responsibility from your office to provide the facts we have presented to you for consideration by North Carolina citizens?

continued...

8316 Arlington Boulevard, Fairfax, Virginia 22038 (703) 573-0505
a division of the National Right to Work Committee

We believe that the students deserve to be taught from materials thoroughly examined and approved on at least the basic soundness of the facts they seek to convey.

Our offices continue to stand ready to assist you in any appropriate manner in what we are convinced is our mutual goal.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Staub
Staff Director

SS/mf
cc. Dr. A. Craig Phillips

National Right To Work Committee

A COALITION OF EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS
HEADQUARTERS AT THE NATION'S CAPITAL

January 25, 1978

Dear North Carolina Right to Work Member:

The enclosed copies of recent correspondence with your State Superintendent of Public Instruction office are important to you.

North Carolina has been approving textbooks for use by your children that teach the Right to Work either unfairly, inaccurately, or both.

On the one hand, you are an unwavering supporter of Right to Work, but your children may be being brainwashed right now in opposition to Right to Work!

The textbooks we sought to identify as inadequate for your state's book adoption process could represent the only discussion of Right to Work they may have in school.

As you can see, objections are well-grounded.

And whether or not an individual believes in Right to Work, as you do, we know you agree that they should be concerned that our children are taught the truth.

We need your help to see that inaccurate textbooks are not used in North Carolina.

Please write to the Superintendent of Public Instruction today and urge him to review and eliminate any textbooks which do not accurately and fairly present the Right to Work.

Our children's education is at stake here, and we believe that's worth fighting for.

We'll appreciate having copies of your letters and any replies you receive.

Sincerely,

Susan Staub

Susan E. Staub
Activities Director

SS/mf
Enclosures

P.S. Textbook adoption is going on right now. Please act today so that students will not continue to be taught bias against Right to Work.

WASHINGTON D.C. HEADQUARTERS: 8316 ARLINGTON BOULEVARD (U.S. 50) SUITE 600 • FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA 22038 • TEL. (703) 573-8550

"Americans must have the right but not be compelled to join labor unions"

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710

RALPH R. DiSIBIO
Superintendent
VICTOR M. HYDEN
Consultant

April 27, 1978

Ms. Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Blvd.
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

Your letter of March 7, 1978, relative to the Right to Work issue in Nevada Textbooks was much appreciated.

The State Textbook Commission advises you that if any complaints exist relative to textbook content, they should be brought to the attention of the appropriate school district. This procedure recognizes local autonomy and responsibility -- a factor much treasured in our State. Each district has a procedure for handling such challenges.

I much appreciated the information submitted and your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Victor M. Hyden
Executive Secretary
Nevada State Textbook Commission

VMH:bg
enclosure:
list of school districts

An Equal Opportunity Agency

SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS

Dr. Clifford J. Lawrence, Superintendent
Carson City School District
P.O. Box 603
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Elmo L. Dericco, Superintendent
Churchill County School District
545 East Richards Street
Fallon, Nevada 89406

Dr. Kenny C. Guinn, Superintendent
Clark County School District
2832 East Flamingo Road
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

George D. Graham, Superintendent
Douglas County School District
P.O. Box 157
Gardnerville, Nevada 89410

Robert J. Zander, Superintendent
Elko County School District
P.O. Box 1012
Elko, Nevada 89801

Preston R. Price, Superintendent
Esmeralda County School District
P.O. Box 546
Goldfield, Nevada 89013

Frederick S. Jackson, Superintendent
Eureka County School District
P.O. Box 249
Eureka, Nevada 89316

Robert J. Scott, Superintendent
Humboldt County School District
P.O. Box 1070
Winnemucca, Nevada 89445

Edward L. Hensley, Superintendent
Lander County School District
P.O. Box 273
Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820

Dr. Neldon Mathews, Superintendent
Lincoln County School District
P.O. Box 118
Panaca, Nevada 89042

Tod V. Carlini, Superintendent
Lyon County School District
P.O. Box GG
Yerington, Nevada 89447

Arlo K. Funk, Superintendent
Mineral County School District
P.O. Box 1547
Hawthorne, Nevada 89415

Joaquin G. Johnson, Superintendent
Nye County School District
P.O. Box 113
Tonopah, Nevada 89049

James R. Kiley, Superintendent
Pershing County School District
P.O. Box 389
Lovelock, Nevada 89419

Hugh J, Gallagher, Superintendent
Storey County School District
P.O. Box 89
Virginia City, Nevada 89440

Dr. Marvin E. Picollo, Superintendent
Washoe County School District
425 East Ninth Street
Reno, Nevada 89512

John R. Orr, Superintendent
White Pine County School District
P.O. Box 400
East Ely, Nevada 89315

Sister Elizabeth Sullivan, O.P.
Superintendent of Parochial Schools
Diocese of Reno
P.O. Box 1211
Reno, Nevada 89504

Bg:8/18/77

Complaints Filed in District-adopting States

Because of the vast procedure involved in corresponding with individual districts (sometimes as many as 400) within a state, we are limiting our involvement in the district-adopting states to states which have the built-in leverage of a Right to Work law.

We have mailed letters to every district in the 7 Right to Work district-adopting states (a total of approximately 1800 districts) asking for lists of social studies texts adopted in that particular district. After evaluating these lists, we will proceed to file individual letters to each district, depending upon the nature of the social studies texts adopted by that district in regards to its treatment of Right to Work.

Attached is a copy of a letter from the Arizona Board of Education, responding to our written complaint before their January 23 Textbook Adoption Committee. Although Arizona is a district-adopting state, it is their policy to adopt a recommended textbook list as a guideline to the districts. Districts may select texts from this list, or, unlike in state-adopting states, they may choose textbooks from other sources. A definite victory for the Textbook Bias Project is illustrated in the February 10 letter, acknowledging that "no texts judged by CEAFU to be offensive to Right to Work were included on the recommended state list."

The March 24 letter to Phoenix U.H.S. District No. 210 is a sample of letters sent to the 89 districts in Arizona, urging them to follow the State Board's example in adopting texts which treat the Right to Work issue fairly and accurately. Also attached are samples of responses we have received from Arizona district boards of education.

We are presently in the process of evaluating textbook lists from each of the remaining 6 Right to Work district adopting states (Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming).

We urge those of you who are from these states to write the Superintendent of Schools in your district and express your concern for the adoption of textbooks which treat the Right to Work issue in an unbiased manner.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

PRESIDENT

MR. J. BEN PICONE
TEMPE

VICE PRESIDENT

MRS. AMY T. WORTHEN
PHOENIX

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

CAROLYN WARNER
STATE SUPERINTENDENT
OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

MEMBERS

MR. O. B. JOY
BISBEE

MRS. ELIZABETH PACKARD
FLAGSTAFF

MR. LEON H. MAEHLING
YUMA

MRS. MIRIAM SOREY
TUCSON

DR. JOHN W. SCHWADA
TEMPE

MR. LYNWOOD EVANS
TEMPE

Arizona
Department of Education

1535 WEST JEFFERSON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
271-5057

February 10, 1978

Ms. Susan E. Straub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against
Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, VA 22038

Dear Ms. Straub:

We wish to acknowledge receipt of correspondence from your organization concerning Arizona's adoption of it's suggested Social Studies Textbook List.

The publications you were concerned about were not included on the recommended list approved January 23, 1978 for use by the public schools in Arizona.

We thank you for your interest and concern.

Sincerely,

Vergil L. Bell

Vergil L. Bell
Administrative Assistant
State Board of Education

Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism

Advisory Board Co-Chairmen

Dr. Edward F. Brufke
Principal
Nether-Providence High School
Wallingford, Pennsylvania

Dr. Fred R. Glahe
Professor of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Shirley K. Schaaf
classroom teacher
President, Kansas City Education Association
Kansas City, Missouri

March 24, 1978

Dr. Gerald DeGrow
Superintendent
Phoenix U.H.S. District No. 210
2526 West Osborn Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85017

Dear Dr. DeGrow:

Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism is the educational division of the National Right to Work Committee, a citizens' group devoted solely to the opposition of compulsory unionism.

CEAFU presented written testimony (copy enclosed) to the State Board of Education on January 23, 1978, calling attention to the fact that Arizona uses some high school social studies texts that are biased and inaccurate in their treatment of the Right to Work issue. As a result of that testimony, we were pleased to be informed by the State Board that no texts mentioned in our complaint were included in the recommended state textbook list.

As you know, Arizona publishes a recommended state list only as a guideline for the districts. Since it is a policy of the State of Arizona to delegate responsibility for textbook selection to local committees, the State Department of Education has encouraged us to direct our concern with textbook treatment of the Right to Work issue in Phoenix Unified High School District No. 210 to you.

We would like to urge the Phoenix Unified High School District No. 210 Board of Education to follow the Arizona State Board of Education in adopting textbooks which not only present the Right to Work issue, but present the issue in an accurate and unbiased manner.

The current social studies textbook list which we received from you in December indicates that the Phoenix district schools are using a text which is offensive in its treatment of the Right to Work issue. That text is:

MAGRUDER'S AMERICAN GOVERNMENT; William A. McClenaghan; Allyn & Bacon, Inc., Boston, 1970-76.

On page 374 of the above text it is stated that "...Several of the states now have so-called 'right-to-work' laws..." We contend that "so-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. The enclosed copy of the Classroom Treatment of the Right to Work presents this objection in detail on pages 15 and 16. In the interest of fairness and accuracy, CEAFU believes this text should be removed from the Phoenix district textbook list until such time that its publisher has taken action to correct this error.

. . . continued

8316 Arlington Boulevard, Fairfax, Virginia 22038 (703) 573-0505

a division of the National Right to Work Committee

For your reference in future social studies adoptions, I have also enclosed a listing of those books we have researched and have found lacking in that they do not discuss the Right to Work issue. We note that Phoenix Unified High School District No. 210 currently adopts two texts from this list. They are:

THE IMPACT OF OUR PAST: A HISTORY OF THE U.S.; Weisenberger;
McGraw Webster, 1976,

and

UNITED STATES HISTORY: SEARCH FOR FREEDOM; Current, et al;
Scott Foresman and Company.

Since the right to work without being compelled to join a union is as integral to the development of the American Labor Movement as is the right to join a union, we urge that these texts be removed from your social studies curriculum until such time that their publishers are persuaded to give equal time to Right to Work.

As we stated in our letter to the Arizona State Board of Education, we base the validity of this request on two points:

(1) Arizona is a Right to Work state, that is, it has a Right to Work law. (A copy of that law is enclosed. In brief, it states that no citizen of Arizona may be denied employment because of membership or nonmembership in a labor union.)

(2) Regardless of whether Arizona is a Right to Work state, it is a sound assumption that it is the duty of educators in a free public education system, when presenting controversial issues, to exercise due caution in seeing that the issues are presented fairly and accurately. Fairness and accuracy certainly must be among the criteria used by Phoenix's Textbook Selection Committee in its textbook evaluations.

In light of these two points, it would seem that an accurate and fair presentation of the Right to Work issue in the textbooks of Phoenix Unified High School District No. 210 would be a goal that CEAFU and the Phoenix District Board of Education would share.

If we may provide further information or assistance of any sort, please let us know immediately. Meanwhile, may we be kept of any action taken concerning this request?

Thank you very much for whatever efforts you may undertake to see that our views are voiced.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Staub
Staff Director

SES/alw
Enclosures

TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

P.O. BOX 4040
1010 EAST TENTH STREET
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85717

Ms. Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators
Against Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

At the request of Dr. Wilbur Lewis, Superintendent of the Tucson Unified School District, I should like to respond to your inquiry regarding use by our teachers of CEAFU materials. Department chairmen have been advised of the availability of CEAFU bibliographies and pamphlets.

Our social studies coordinator has placed CEAFU evaluations of twenty-eight texts on ready reference for teachers as they are concerned in the material selection process. We also make use of the recommended state textbook list published by the State Board of Education in the adoption process, K-8.

In our social studies classes, it is our purpose to assure that different sides of an issue are presented to students. Most social studies classes make use of room collections of materials, pamphlets, books and magazines, to supplement texts or to be used as a textbook package. This variety of classroom materials helps teachers to provide materials representative of differing points of view existing within our society.

Thank you for calling to our attention the CEAFU materials. We appreciate the opportunity we will have to use this information for reference as we continue to work on the selection of materials for our students.

Sincerely,

Florence Reynolds

Florence Reynolds
Deputy Superintendent
Educational Services

FSR/ng
4/25/78
cc: Dr. Lewis
Mr. Klingenfus

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Salome High School

BICENTENNIAL UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 76

OF

BOX 178 SALOME, ARIZONA 85348 PHONE: 859-3453

April 18, 1978

Ms. Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
8316 Arlington Blvd.
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

Your letter of March 24, 1978, was presented to the Bicentennial Union High School District Board of Education.

The Board of Education believes that to change textbooks now would be too expensive. However, in the future, your suggested list of textbooks will be viewed prior to any social studies textbook purchase.

The instructor who uses the textbook in question has been informed to treat the right-to-work laws as fairly as possible.

Thank you for your concern.

Sincerely,

OK Nutting

Orval K. Nutting
Principal

fb

Phoenix Union High School System

DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES
2526 West Osborn Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85017
Telephone: 602 - 257-3131
Patrick B. Henderson, Ed.D., Superintendent

April 25, 1978

Ms. Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

Thank you for your letter of March 24, 1978, calling to our attention the concern that some high school social studies texts currently adopted by our district are biased and inaccurate in their treatment of the Right-to-Work issue.

Your letter was reviewed by the Social Studies Department Chairpersons on Tuesday, April 11, 1978. The chairs noted that there is an elaborate system for adopting textbooks in the Phoenix Union High School District. This system includes a review and approval of the textbooks at the school site by a School Textbook Committee composed of students, parents, and teachers.

If the text is a hardback text, it must again be reviewed and approved by a District Textbook Committee composed of students, parents, department chairpersons, principals, and the District Human Relations Consultant. The meetings of the local and District textbook committees are public and open to anyone who wishes to voice objections to the textbooks that are being adopted. When the meetings were scheduled this year, there was no indication of a concern such as you have expressed.

In reviewing the textbook materials, the Social Studies Department Chairs indicated that there is no such thing as a perfect textbook. The textbook is a tool used by the teacher to supplement the instructional goals and performance objectives established by the teacher and the District. Since all of the teachers in Social Studies who use the textbooks in question have expertise in their field, they would be more than able to present the other side of the Right-to-Work issue if the textbook does display bias.

I wish to thank you for your concern regarding the textbooks adopted in the Phoenix Union High School District. Please contact me if you have any further questions.

Sincerely yours,

Carolyn L. Scott

Carolyn L. Scott, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

CLS:cp

cc: Tom McDonald

COMPLAINTS TO BE FILED IN 1978

As indicated on the "adoption date" sheet, social studies adoptions will be coming up in six state-adopting states in 1978. CEAFU will be directing complaints to each of these states, according to guidelines set up by individual State Boards of Education.

If your state is one of those six states adopting social studies texts this year, we encourage you to use the following information in writing letters to State Textbook Commission members, urging them to consider social studies texts which treat the Right to Work issue accurately and without bias.

States adopting in 1978 are:

RTW STATES

South Carolina

A list of Textbook Evaluating and Rating Committee members will be published on May 18, 1978. In order to obtain this list, write to:

H. G. Hollingsworth, Jr.
Director, Office of General Education
State of S.C. Department of Education
Educational Television Center
2712 Millwood Avenue
Columbia, South Carolina 29250

Send letters to Committee members by September, 1978. Letters to the State Superintendent of Education (address below) should be written before October 23, 1978. Final social studies* adoption will be held on November 15, 1978.

Cyril B. Busbee
State Superintendent of Education
State of S.C. Department of Education
Educational Television Center
2712 Millwood Avenue
Columbia, South Carolina 29250

* Social studies adoptions in South Carolina are divided by subjects. This year adoptions will be held in citizenship, civics, economics and government.

Tennessee

The Tennessee State Textbook Commission begins its social studies adoption in July. The actual adoption is completed the second week in November. Letters should be written to members of the State Textbook Commission before the November meeting. Names and addresses of Commission members are listed below:

Mr. G. Hugh Waters, Chairman, Area Superintendent
Metro-Nashville Public Schools, Nashville 37216

Mr. Fred V. Standley, Superintendent
Jackson City Schools, Jackson 38301

Miss Mildred E. Doyle, Superintendent
Knox County Schools, Knoxville 37902

Mr. Ralph S. Haynes, Principal
Barrets Chapel School, Arlington 38002

Mrs. Norma Morelock
Sunnyside Elementary School, Greeneville 37743

Mrs. Jean Andrews
1005 Alicia Lane, Columbia 38401

Dr. Sam Ingram, Secretary
Commissioner of Education, Nashville 37219

Texas

In the field of social studies, adoption will be held for American History, only.

A list of State Textbook Committee members will be published in May. In order to obtain this list, write to:

J. Henry Perry, Jr., Director
Textbook Division
Texas Education Agency
201 E. Eleventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Along with letters to the State Textbook Committee, write to:

State Commissioner of Education
Texas Education Agency
201 E. Eleventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Letters should be written before August 16th, 1978. Final voting will be September 11, 12, and 13.

Virginia

Send letters to members of the Textbook Selection Committee before November 10, 1978. For a list of Textbook Selection Committee members, write to:

Harry L. Smith, Special Assistant
Public Information and Publications
Commonwealth of Virginia
Department of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

Send letters until December 10, 1978 (final social studies adoption date) to:

Dr. Carl L. Riehm
Assistant Superintendent for
Curriculum and Instruction
Commonwealth of Virginia
Department of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

NON-RTW STATES

Indiana

Attached is a letter to Indiana Key Activists soliciting help in making our research known as widely as possible. As the letter explains, local textbook committees made up of teachers nominated by their principals, are set up in 5 regions (see enclosed map). These local committees review texts and make recommendations to the State Department of Public Instruction on June 30th, 1978. All letters directed to local committee members should be mailed before this date. The names of textbook committee members in your region most likely can be obtained through your high school principal or district Superintendent of Schools.

After June 30th (and before November 26) letters should be sent to members of the Indiana Commission on Textbook Adoptions. Names and addresses of Commission members are listed below:

Mrs. Ann Foyer
4710 Andover Road
Indianapolis, Indiana 46226

Ms. Christina J. Harris
Homan Elementary School
210 E. Joliet Street
Schererville, Indiana 46375

Ms. Irma Hayes
Program Assitant for Education
and Youth Incentive
Indianapolis Urban League
445 N. Pennsylvania, Room 406
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

. . . continued

Indiana (cont'd.)

Mrs. Bettye Lou Jerrel
P. O. Box 2544
Station D
Evansville, Indiana 47714

Mr. William W. Lyon
Muncie Community Schools
328 East Washington Street
Muncie, Indiana 47305

Dr. Janet M. Wickersham
Crestdale Elementary School
701 Crestdale Drive
Richmond, Indiana 47374

Also write to:

Harold H. Negley, Superintendent
Department of Public Instruction
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Oregon

The official social studies textbook list is adopted on November 15, 1978 by an appointed State Textbook Commission. Names and addresses of commission members are listed below:

Miss Jule Crume
Chairperson
Director of Instructional Programs
South Lane School District 45J
103 South 5th Street
Cottage Grove, Oregon 97401

Mr. Calvin Yasumiishi
Vice Chairperson
Teacher, Ontario Junior High School
497 SW 3rd Avenue
Ontario, Oregon 97914

Mrs. Lucille Bailey
Director of Special Pupil Services
Reynolds School District No. 7
Route 2, Box 496
Troutdale, Oregon 97060

Dr. George V. Guy
Professor of Education
Portland State University
P. O. Box 751
Portland, Oregon 97207

Mr. G. Claude Martin, Superintendent
Neah-Kah-Nie School District No. 56
P. O. Box 15
Rockaway, Oregon 97136

Mrs. Clara Moore, Member
Klamath Falls School Board District No. 1
324 South 5th Street
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97601

Mrs. Gail Walker, Teacher
Riverside Elementary School
North Clackamas School District
16303 SE River Road
Milwaukie, Oregon 97222

Also write to:

Mr. Verne A. Duncan
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Oregon Department of Education
942 Lancaster Drive NE
Salem, Oregon 97310

Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism

Advisory Board Co-Chairmen

Dr. Edward F. Brizius
Principal
Nether-Providence High School
Wallingford, Pennsylvania

Dr. Fred R. Glahe
Professor of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Shirley K. Schauf
classroom teacher
President, Kansas City Education Association
Kansas City, Missouri

March 16, 1978

Dear Indiana Key Activist:

CEAFU's classroom textbook bias study has been uncovering numerous examples of inaccurate presentations of the Right to Work issue in high school social studies materials. We are compiling these examples so that we may file complaints with state textbook adoption commissions.

Indiana's textbook adoption schedule calls for the review of social studies texts in 1978. Committees are set up in five regions of teachers nominated by their principals. (See enclosed map.) These area committees will be evaluating texts and making recommendations to the state superintendent. Actual adoption is the responsibility of the textbook commission.

We are calling on you, as a supporter of CEAFU, to help us make our research known as widely as possible. Do you know anyone who may be on one of these committees? Could you suggest someone to whom we may send our information?

The enclosed news release capsulates some of the research data we have to date. We know you are keenly interested in seeing that Indiana's social studies and government textbooks treat the Right to Work issue accurately and without bias.

I'll be looking forward to hearing from you soon on this vital aspect of our programs.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Staub
Staff Director

SES/slw
Enclosures

8316 Arlington Boulevard, Fairfax, Virginia 22038 (703) 573-0505
a division of the National Right to Work Committee

Regions for Textbook Adoption Reviews

II. COMPLAINTS FILED WITH TEXTBOOK PUBLISHERS

COMPLAINTS

FILED WITH PUBLISHERS

To date, 22 evaluations have been sent to textbook publishing companies. These evaluations request future revisions of the text under complaint. A sample letter is included along with the replies that have been received.

Our ultimate goal in this phase of the textbook project is to be consulted in the future by authors and publishers in the writing of material concerning the American labor movement.

Because the Right to Work issue is one single purpose issue, we have the extensive knowledge and background required for factual presentations of this phase of the labor movement. The supplementary classroom materials we have developed and can provide will allow a balanced presentation to be made.

The textbook publishers have so far been willing to review our evaluations and have indicated an interest in working cooperatively with CEAFU in future publications.

Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism

Advisory Board Co-Chairmen

Dr. Edward F. Brafte
Principal
Nether-Providence High School
Wallingford, Pennsylvania

Dr. Fred R. Glahe
Professor of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Shirley K. Schaaf
classroom teacher
President, Kansas City Education Association
Kansas City, Missouri

COPY

Dear Textbook Publisher:

Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism is the educational division of the National Right to Work Committee, a citizens group devoted solely to the opposition of compulsory unionism. Since 1975, our researchers have reviewed over 135 classroom materials for high school history and government courses to evaluate their treatment of the Right to Work issue.

As a result of this study, we have been able to assist state textbook adoption commissions in their evaluations and recommendations of textbooks. These considerations ensure their students of an accurate and unbiased view of the American Labor Movement, specifically, the treatment of the problem of compulsory unionism.

Directly resulting from a complaint filed with the social studies specialist of the Utah State Board of Education, the Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company has agreed to correct unfair and incomplete coverage of the Right to Work issue in their textbook, American Government in Action. A copy of the letter from the Merrill Company is enclosed for your information.

We applaud Robert Kellar, Senior Product Manager of the Merrill Company's social studies division, for the forthright manner in which he has taken steps to ensure students of a balanced view of the Right to Work issue in future textbooks.

We are urging other textbook publishers to follow the lead of the Merrill Company and include in their texts a factual and thorough study of Right to Work.

We would like to bring to your attention your textbook, (TITLE OF TEXTBOOK; AUTHOR). In evaluating the social studies materials described, we have found the passages specified in the enclosed evaluation to be in error and have stated our specific objections.

. . . continued

8316 Arlington Boulevard, Fairfax, Virginia 22038 (703) 573-0505
a division of the National Right to Work Committee

You may be interested to know that our research has disclosed that of the 45 out of 135 commonly used high school government texts which even deal with the Right to Work issue, 51% discuss it unfairly, inaccurately, or both. We are urging you to take immediate corrective steps to ensure that any treatment of the Right to Work issue be presented in its objective entirety. We will be distributing our study to curriculum supervisors in every state, to that end, and hope to report your willingness to work with us toward what we believe is our mutual goal.

In conclusion, we are hopeful that as a publisher of texts for junior high and high school students, you will tap every available source in the interest of fairness and accuracy. We believe we can be of service to you in the researching of this, our single-purpose issue, and urge you to contact us concerning Right to Work, any form of compulsory unionism, or exclusive representation.

We look forward to hearing from you soon and to providing you with any further information which may be useful to you.

Sincerely,

Susan Staub

Susan E. Staub
Staff Director

SES/slb
Enclosures

P.S. Since we hope to report our progress to our key leaders at our Annual Meeting in May, we will appreciate your giving this matter your attention as soon as possible.

CHARLES E MERRILL PUBLISHING COMPANY
A BELL & HOWELL COMPANY

SERVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS SINCE 1842

1300 Alum Creek Drive Columbus, Ohio 43216 (614) 258-8441

November 30, 1977

Ms. Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

Your letter and enclosures detailing criticisms regarding coverage on "right-to-work" laws in our text, American Government in Action, sent to Mr. Boone C. Colegrove, the Social Studies Specialist of the Utah State Board of Education, have been forwarded to us.

First, I would like to let you know that the criticisms you raised have been turned over to the editorial department, and I am certain that appropriate changes in the text regarding the "right-to-work" coverage will be made at the first opportunity.

Certainly, I would agree that "so-called" tends to lend an aura of question to "legitimate" laws. Right-to-work laws are right-to-work laws.

Charles E. Merrill Company is always interested in improving its publications to meet the needs of students. Certainly presenting any controversial issue should be done in a fair and accurate manner. Unconscious editorializing whenever noticed should be corrected to eliminate "bias."

We thank you for raising this matter and we will take steps to correct it in revisions of the material.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Kellar

Robert E. Kellar
Senior Product Manager,
Social Studies

REK/lb
cc: Jeanne Truex
Alta Moser

Dedicated to serving
AMSCO
our nation's youth

AMSCO SCHOOL PUBLICATIONS, INC.
315 HUDSON STREET · NEW YORK, N. Y. 10013
PHONE (212) 675-7000

May 4, 1978

Ms. Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, VA 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

I received your letter of April 26, and, as you requested, I am replying promptly. I have referred your helpful comments on the treatment of the Taft-Hartley Act in pages 354 to 355 of American Studies: A Conceptual Approach by Irving L. Gordon to our Social Studies Department and the author.

Like you, we are concerned about presenting a balanced and fair account of controversial issues. We have, therefore, given serious consideration to your criticisms and will make appropriate changes at the first opportunity.

Meanwhile, I want to thank you for writing to us and offering your detailed evaluation of our material on the controversy regarding the Taft-Hartley Act. We are always grateful for any opportunity to refine or improve our instructional materials.

Yours truly,

Robert J. Lowenherz
Editor-in-Chief

RJL:mw

WE ARE AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER, MALE/FEMALE.

ALLYN AND BACON, INC. / 470 ATLANTIC AVENUE, BOSTON, MASS. 02210

May 4, 1978

Since 1868... Leading Educational Publishers

Ms. Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against
Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Blvd.
Fairfax, VA 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

Thank you for your letter of April 26, 1978, regarding the treatment of the right to work issue in classroom materials for high school history and government courses.

You will be pleased to know that the term "so-called" has been deleted in the 1978 edition of MAGRUDER'S AMERICAN GOVERNMENT. The sentence now reads:

> Several of the States now have "right to work" laws, which ban both the closed and the union shop; they provide only for the open shop - a worker may join a union or not, as he or she sees fit. (p. 592)

Right to work laws are not discussed by name in the text because the discussion in this section of the chapter is directed to the provisions of The Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, one of four particular statutes that form the base of national regulation of labor-management relations today.

Allyn and Bacon appreciates your calling this matter to our attention; we shall give every consideration to expanding the discussion of the right to work issue in the next revision of this book.

I am sorry to report that TODAY'S PROBLEMS: SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES FACING AMERICA, the other book you cite, is out of print.

Thank you again for writing to us.

Sincerely,

Alvin M. White
Executive Editor
Social Sciences

/eg

cc: P. Parsons

Xerox Education Publications

245 Long Hill Road
Middletown, Connecticut 06457
203 347-7251

May 5, 1978

Susan E. Staub, Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Miss Staub:

Our President, Robert J. Moore, has forwarded to us your evaluation of our right-to-work chapter in the unit book The Labor Movement.

We find that your first point on the use of union workers versus working people is a valid one. Also, in rereading the chapter, we see other areas in need of revision in light of new information and developments in the right-to-work issue in the United States.

Due to this study, we intend to revise this chapter at the next reprinting. We will hold your evaluation and statistics along with other reference material for guidance for the revision. You can assure your group at its annual meeting that we have every intention of presenting the right-to-work issue as fairly as possible.

We always appreciate hearing from educators, students, and concerned citizens about our publications. We would like to be added to your mailing list so we may be kept informed.

Most cordially,

Elaine P. Wonsavage
Assistant Publisher
XEROX EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS

EPW:rc

Webster/McGraw-Hill Division

1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020

McGraw-Hill Book Company

May 8, 1978

Ms. Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

Your letter to Mr. Donald F. Fruehling of April 18, 1978 has been forwarded to my office for reply.

The McGraw-Hill book your reviewers evaluated, The Challenge of Democracy, fifth edition, 1966, was declared out of print several years ago. We have no plans to issue any further editions.

We currently have two texts which treat the history of the labor movement in the United States. They are The Impact of Our Past, second edition, 1976, and As It Happened: A History of the United States, 1975.

We look forward to receiving your reviewers' evaluations.

Sincerely,

Don E. Neal
Senior Editor
Social Studies

DEN/m

cc: D. F. Fruehling
L. A. Walsh
R. G. Marshall

D.C. Heath and Company

125 Spring Street
Lexington, Massachusetts 02173
Telephone (617) 862-6650

May 3, 1978

Ms. Susan E. Staub
Staff Director
Concerned Educators Against
Forced Unionism
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

Dear Ms. Staub:

Mr. Brian McLaughlin has forwarded your letter regarding ONE NATION: AN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT TEXT WITH READINGS to my attention. We have completed our latest printing of this work and do not anticipate a new printing in the near future. If we do reprint, however, we will bring your letter to the authors' attention.

I think it is important to understand that our authors take full credit and responsibility for their text, and final decisions regarding content and language rest with them. However, the publisher is in a position to offer suggestions with respect to uses of language, and we will retain your letter on file as reference for future publications.

Sincerely,

Joseph W. Hodges III
Manager
Editorial Acquisitions

A Raytheon Company